"One other qualification, a matter of personal character, was mentioned in general discussions of chieftainship. The quality emphasized is courtesy, already mentioned as one of the master-values. Kindly speech from a chief is so highly valued that it is believed to confer long life on his people, while evil speech from a chief may mean death to them. So if a man otherwise eligible for chieftainship has a reputation for 'bad talk', he may be passed over, and the title conferred on one of his juniors who keeps a civil tongue in his head."

"A sentiment that in a way counteracts that of rank--at least counteracts any tendency to take advantage of rank by arrogance--is that of kindliness. There is less evidence in the way of formal patterns of behavior to attest the strength of this sentiment than the others. The high value placed on kindliness is probably related to the absence of sorcery, though there is no telling, on the evidence at hand, just what the relationship is.

The particular form of kindliness usually singled out for praise is kindly speech. People are praised for what Tom called 'fine talk'. 'Bad talk' is condemned, and people with a reputation for what we call 'a sharp tongue' are avoided. Or so they say; we never knew an actual instance among this courteous people, who seem to live up to their ideal in this respect amazingly well. Children were sometimes scolded--mostly, so far as I noticed, for a boldness toward us that was considered presumptuous. But the scoldings were mild, as compared with tongue-lashings far from rare in our culture. The only voices I heard raised in serious anger were directed at the psychopath Tarobweliman, whose defiance of the [203] proprieties wore out the patience of his relatives.

People told us repeatedly that they liked us better than the Japanese because of our kindly talk. This was itself a case of the fine talk they value. No doubt there was flattery in it. Yet I think there was truth as well. Naturally our address to them was friendly; a considerable part of our job was to win their confidence and enlist their

help, without which we could never have worked up more than a superficial account of their culture. Besides, it was no strain to talk kindly to these masters of the soft answer.

Fine talk is particularly important in people who are important themselves; most of all in the chiefs. In discussing succession to chieftainship, I once asked Tom if a man who was first in line of succession to a title might be passed over because of undesirable personal qualities. Without stopping to refer the matter to the chiefs--though they were there to be consulted--Tom said oh, yes; if the heir-apparent was given to bad talk, he would never be considered for the title.

Songs in praise of various chiefs extoll their talk more than anything else, referring especially to the formal speeches at public assemblages. Some of the praise is for oratorical skill; a smooth, rich flow of words, 'like coconut oil'. But the main emphasis is on kindliness. More than one of the songs refers to a belief that if the talk of the chiefs is kindly, the people will thrive and live long; if the talk of the chiefs is harsh, the people will perish. How strong this belief is, I have no way of telling; but it accords so well with this sentiment of kindliness, as expressed particularly in speech, that it is pretty surely more than empty words. The positive value in the sentiment of kindliness is the joy of pleasant human relationships. It corresponds to the Thomas-Znaniecki wish for response. That wish is also exemplified in the master-sentiment here mentioned only in passing: that of sexual fulfilment."

28: Spiro--110-111
116, 577, 867, 626

(1947-48) 1949

Woleaians-1-3
Ifalik

"As in all cultures, Ifaluk too inculcates its values in its children, and it does a very good job, since the behaviors not sanctioned by the culture all of which are found in the children, are extinguished in the adults. [sic] In order to have as complete and valid information as possilbe on the socialization process--both the kinds of behavior sanctioned and the techniques used, both rewards and punishments. I used three checks. I employed adult informants to tell me what is done, I interviewed all the children, and I recorded my own observations. The second technique lent itself to statistical recording, which I shall produce here. The amazing thing (to me) was the identical results obtained by the three methods. All three techniques show that the non-sanctioned behaviors are: theft, disobedience, aggression (including stone throwing at people, fighting, and aggression against parents), standing and talking in the presence of adults. There is one contribution each by the adults and children that the other did not make. The adults said that children are told that they should not by lazy, but should acquire economic skill, lest they have no food. But this is a general admonition for the future, not a child's possible derelicition for which he is punished. The children added a misdemeanor for which they are punished that the adults did not mention--playing away from home, and not returning to eat.

Table 1

Total Number of Children From About 3 to 25

Total subjects: 42 Male: 25 Female: 17

Misdeed	No. of subjects	% of subjects	Male %	Female %
Fighting	21	50	56	41
Disobedience	18	43	40	47
Stone Throwing	11	26	36	12
Theft	10	23	32	11
Standing and talking in the presence of of adults (in canoe house)	10	23	40	0
Playing without returning home to eat.	7	16	16	23
Physical aggression against parents	3	17	0	17
Miscellaneous	14	33	28	41

Table one is the record of the misdeeds for which the children said they were punished. The figures speak for themselves, and no comment is necessary except to point out

practically all punishable behavior fall in the category of aggression.

Some of the sex differences may be commented upon, however. It will be seen that boys do more stealing and stone throwing than the girls, for reasons difficult to answer. The greater incidence of stealing among boys may be accounted for by the fact that most stolen objects are stolen from the canoe houses, and only the boys have completely free access to canoe houses. That girls do not violate the injunction against standing and talking in the presence of men can be accounted for on the same grounds. The category in which there are no male offenders is probably a result of the greater economic responsibility thrust on the young girl, which she resents, and for which she vents her aggressions. The fact that it is the mother rather than the father, that is the brunt of the aggression is a further indication of this fact, since it is the mother that has the girl work at home.

Before we examine the techniques of enforcing these values, I may say that they are admirably successful. Though fighting occurs frequently among the children, I have seen children above the ages of ten fighting, and this pattern extends into adult life [sic] The same holds true of the other non-sanctioned behavior listed above. Of [111] course, some children learn to inhibit these culturally defined anti-social impulses before others. But it may be stated dogmatically that no child, after the age of ten, is guilty of any of them. And, what is of even greater importance, no adult is ever guilty of commiting them."